

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,599	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RAMY M. OSMAN	2457	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) RAMY M. OSMAN. (3) ____.

(2) Ningning Xu (reg# L0293). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-18 and 20-22.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lango (6.813.690).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Xu clarified the invention to the Examiner and discussed proposed amendments that would overcome the previous 101 and 103 rejections. An agreement was reached that the proposed amendments overcome the primary reference as it was combined in the previous 103 rejections dated 3/5/08.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.